arXiv:1209.6522v1 [math.AP] 28 Sep 2012

Solenoidal Lipschitz truncation for parabolic PDE's

D. Breit, L. Diening, S. Schwarzacher

LMU Munich, Institute of Mathematics, Theresienstr. 39, 80333-Munich, Germany

---

Abstract

We consider functions $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(L^2) \cap L^p(W^{1,p})$ with $1 < p < \infty$ on a time space domain. Solutions to non-linear evolutionary PDE's typically belong to these spaces. Many applications require a Lipschitz approximation $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ of $\mathbf{u}$ which coincides with $\mathbf{u}$ on a large set. For problems arising in fluid mechanics one needs to work with solenoidal (divergence-free) functions. Thus, we construct a Lipschitz approximation, which is also solenoidal. As an application we revise the existence proof for non-stationary generalized Newtonian fluids in [DRW10]. Since $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}_\lambda = 0$, we are able to work in the pressure free formulation, which heavily simplifies the proof. We also provide a simplified approach to the stationary solenoidal Lipschitz truncation of [BDF12].

Keywords: solenoidal Lipschitz truncation; divergence free truncation; Navier-Stokes; generalized Newtonian fluids
2000 MSC: 76B03, 35D05, 35J60, 26B35

---

1. Introduction

The purpose of the Lipschitz truncation technique is to approximate a Sobolev function $u \in W^{1,p}$ by λ-Lipschitz functions u_λ that coincide with u up to a set of small measure. The functions u_λ are constructed non-linearly by modifying u on the level set of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of the gradient ∇u. This idea goes back to Acerbi and Fusco [AF88]. Lipschitz truncations are used in various areas of analysis: calculus of variations, in the existence theory of partial differential equations, and in the regularity theory. We refer to [DMS08] for a longer list of references.

We are interested in the motion of incompressible fluids. The balance of momentum reads in the stationary case as

$$\operatorname{div}\mathbf{S} = (\nabla \mathbf{v})\mathbf{v} + \nabla \pi - \mathbf{f}, \tag{1.1}$$

Email addresses: `breit@math.lmu.de` (D. Breit), `diening@math.lmu.de` (L. Diening), `schwarz@math.lmu.de` (S. Schwarzacher)

where $\mathbf{v}$ is the velocity, $(\nabla\mathbf{v})\mathbf{v} := (v_i\partial_i v_j)_{1\leq j\leq n}$ denotes the convective term, $\mathbf{S}$ is the stress deviator, π the pressure, and $\mathbf{f}$ is the external force. In order to prescribe the properties of a special fluid one needs a constitutive law which relates $\mathbf{S}$ and the symmetric gradient $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}) := \frac{1}{2}\big(\nabla\mathbf{v} + \nabla\mathbf{v}^T\big)$ of the velocity field. The most common model for Non-Newtonian fluids is (see [AM74, BAH87])

$$\mathbf{S} = (\kappa + |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v})|)^{p-2}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\kappa \geq 0$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Such fluids are sometimes called generalized Newtonian fluids. From the mathematical point of view this problem was firstly investigated by Ladyzhenskaya [Lad67, Lad68, Lad69] and Lions [Lio69] in the late sixties. The existence of a weak solution $\mathbf{v} \in W^{1,p}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega)$ to (1.1)-(1.2) is today quite standard provided $p > \frac{3n}{n+2}$. Here the solution is an admissible test function to the weak equation and one can directly apply the monotone operator theory. For smaller values of p the Lipschitz truncation was firstly used in the fluid context in [FMS03], the existence of a weak solution was shown provided $p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$. The idea is to rewrite $(\nabla\mathbf{v})\mathbf{v}$ as $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{v}\otimes\mathbf{v})$ (using $\mathrm{div}\mathbf{v} = 0$) and apply the Lipschitz truncation to our test function. The technique was improved in [DMS08], where also electro-rheological fluids were considered. In this paper the estimate

$$\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_\lambda\chi_{\{\mathbf{u}\neq\mathbf{u}_\lambda\}}\|_p \leq \delta(\lambda),$$

where $\delta(\lambda) \to 0$ for a suitable sequence $\lambda \to \infty$. This implies the convergence $\mathbf{u}_\lambda \to \mathbf{u}$ (for $\lambda \to \infty$) in $W^{1,p}$ which does not follow from the results of Acerbi-Fusco in [AF88].

For the system (1.1) it is often convenient to work with the so called pressure free formulation. This is achieved by the use of solenoidal (i.e. divergence-free) test functions, since they are orthogonal to the pressure gradient. The problem of the standard Lipschitz truncation is, that it does not conserve the solenoidal property. The easiest strategy to overcome this deficit is to correct the functions $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ by means of the Bogovskiĭ operator. This operator works nice in the uniform convex setting, i.e. on L^p with $1 < p < \infty$. However, it cannot be used in the non-uniform convex setting, e.g. L^1, L^∞ or L^h with $h(t) = t\ln(1+t)$, since the Bogovskiĭ correction is a singular integral operator. So in the limit cases the Bogovskiĭ-corrected Lipschitz truncation loses some of its important fine properties. This is particular the case in the setting of Prandtl-Eyring fluids (see [Eyr36]), where the constitutive relation reads as

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{\log(1 + |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v})|)}{|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v})|}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}). \tag{1.3}$$

To overcome these problems one needs a solenoidal Lipschitz truncation. Therefore in [BDF12] a truncation method was developed which allows to approximate $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega)$ by a solenoidal Lipschitz function $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ without loosing the fine properties of the truncation.

Now, let us turn to the parabolic problem: the balance of momentum reads as

$$-\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathrm{div} \mathbf{S} = (\nabla \mathbf{u})\mathbf{u} + \nabla \pi - \mathbf{f}, \tag{1.4}$$

and all involved quantities are defined on the parabolic cube $Q := (0, T) \times \Omega$. Here the situation is much more delicate since the distributional time derivative $\partial_t \mathbf{v}$ interacts with the pressure which also only exists in the sense of distributions. In [DRW10] it is shown how to get a weak solution to (1.4) provided $p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$. This is based on a parabolic Lipschitz truncation and a deep understanding of the pressure. Further results about parabolic Lipschitz truncation are due to Kinnunen-Lewis [KL02]. In addition to the properties one needs in the stationary setting we need to know what happens with the terms $\langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_\lambda \rangle$ (which appears if one tests the equation with the truncated function $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$). In [DRW10] it is shown that

$$\big| \langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_\lambda \rangle \big| \leq \delta(\lambda), \tag{1.5}$$

where $\delta(\lambda) \to 0$ if $\lambda \to \infty$. The main ingredients are a parabolic Poincaré-inequality and a suitable scaling. The aim of this paper is to develope a Lipschitz truncation $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ for a function $\mathbf{u} \in L^p(W^{1,p}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega))$ which is in addition to the properties in [DRW10, KL02] solenoidal.

The main motivation for doing so, is to develop an existence theory for (non-stationary) generalized Newtonian fluids which completely avoids the appearance of the pressure (note that this cannot be done by a Bogovskiĭ-correction). This heavily simplifies the existence proof for generalized Newtonian fluids from [DRW10], see Section 3. We expect that our approach will be useful in the investigation of electro-rheological fluids [Růž00] and Prandtl-Eyring fluids [Eyr36]. In this situations it is not possible to reconstruct the pressure in the right spaces. So the standard Lipschitz truncation approach will fail.

In this paper we will construct a solenoidal Lipschitz truncation. Let $\mathbf{u} \in L^p(I, W^{1,p}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega))$ be a function with

$$\int_Q \partial_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t = \int_Q \mathbf{G} : \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\xi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}(Q),$$

where $C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}$ is the space of compactly supported, smooth, solenoidal function. Then there is a function $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ with roughly the following properties (see Theorem 2.14 for a precise formulation).

(a) $\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda \in L^\infty(\mathrm{BMO})$ with $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda\| \leq c\lambda$ and $\mathrm{div}\, \mathbf{u}_\lambda = 0$.

(b) $\mathbf{u}_\lambda = \mathbf{u}$ a.e. outside a suitable set $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and

$$\big|\langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_\lambda\rangle\big| + \|\chi_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} \nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda\|_p \leq c\big(\lambda^p |\mathcal{O}_\lambda|\big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \delta(\lambda),$$

with $\delta(\lambda) \to 0$ if $\lambda \to \infty$.

Let us explain the rough ideas of the construction and some difficulties: We start with the open set $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, where the maximal functions of $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ or $\mathbf{G}$ is bigger than λ. Consider a Whitney decomposition of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ into cubes Q_i with a special parabolic scaling. Let φ_i be a subordinate partition of unity. On $Q \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ the gradient $\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda$ is already bounded, so we need to change the function only on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. In [DRW10, KL02] this is done via the following construction with mean values $\mathbf{u}_i = \langle \mathbf{u}\rangle_{Q_i}$.

$$\mathbf{u}_\lambda := \begin{cases} \mathbf{u} & \text{on } Q \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda, \\ \sum_i \varphi_i \mathbf{u}_i & \text{on } Q \cap \mathcal{O}_\lambda. \end{cases}$$

Of course $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ is not solenoidal in general. So the first idea is to set

$$\mathbf{u}_\lambda := \begin{cases} \mathbf{u} & \text{on } Q \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda, \\ \operatorname{curl}\Big(\sum_i \varphi_i \Pi_i \big(\operatorname{curl}^{-1} \mathbf{u}\big)\Big) & \text{on } Q \cap \mathcal{O}_\lambda, \end{cases}$$

where Π_i is a local linear approximation. This approach is very useful in the stationary context. It simplifies the construction of a solenoidal Lipschitz truncation from [BDF12], which was based on local Bogovskiĭ projections. We present this new approach in Section 4.

However in the non-stationary situation we are confronted with the following problem: The L^∞-estimates for $\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda$ require a parabolic Poincaré inequality. This needs an information about the distributional time-derivative which is connected with the pressure via the equation of motion (see (1.4)). It is not enough to control $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$ as a functional on the solenoidal test-functions. So the construction above leads to a solenoidal Lipschitz truncation where its time derivative still needs information about the pressure and is therefore not very useful. The main problem in our construction is to overcome this difficulty which needs a deep understanding of the equation, especially the properties of the time derivative. The main idea is to replace the constant approximation $\mathbf{u}_i = \langle \mathbf{u}\rangle_{Q_i}$ by a carefully chosen function which is harmonic in space.

The new solenoidal Lipschitz truncation can be found in Section 2. In Section 3 we revisit the existence proof for non-stationary motion of generalized Newtonian fluids in order to present how useful this approximation is.

2. Solenoidal truncation – evolutionary case

In this section we examine solenoidal functions, whose time derivative is only well defined via the duality with solenoidal test functions.

Let $Q_0 = I_0 \times B_0 \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3$ be a space time cylinder. Let $\mathbf{u} \in L^\sigma(I_0, W^{1,\sigma}_{\mathrm{div}}(B_0))$ and $\mathbf{G} \in L^\sigma(Q_0)$ satisfy

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \partial_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{G} : \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\xi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}(Q_0), \tag{2.1}$$

where we use the subscript $_{\mathrm{div}}$ to denote the subspace of solenoidal functions. The goal of this section is to construct a solenoidal truncation $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ of $\mathbf{u}$ by preserving the properties of the truncation in [KL02] and [DRW10]. In these papers, equation (2.1) is valid for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C^\infty_0(Q)$, so one has more control of the time derivative $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$. This extra control allows to derive a parabolic Poincaré estimate for $\mathbf{u}$ in terms of $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{G}$, see [DRW10, Theorem B.1].

In our situation we are confronted with the problem, that the time derivative $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$ is only defined as a functional on solenoidal test functions. Therefore, we have not enough control of $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$ to derive a parabolic Poincaré estimate. This problem was overcome in [DRW10] by introducing a pressure in (2.1). This pressure splits into a pressure related to $\mathbf{G}$ and a time derivative of a harmonic pressure related to $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$. Then the sum of $\mathbf{u}$ and the harmonic pressure solves a system of the form (2.1) for all test functions $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C^\infty_0(Q)$. The truncation technique is then applied to this sum. We want to avoid the introduction of the pressure, since it is very inflexible and complicates the application of the truncation method.

Because $\mathbf{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ are both solenoidal in (2.1), they can both be written as the curl of a vector field. This will allow us to rewrite (2.1) as a system that is valid for all functions. Since the definition of the curl operator depends on the dimension, we will restrict ourselves in the following for simplicity to the case $n = 3$.

Let us be more precise. First we extend our function $\mathbf{u}$ in a suitable way on the whole space and then apply the inverse curl operator.

Let $\gamma \in C^\infty_0(B_0)$ with$\chi_{\frac{1}{2}B_0} \leq \gamma \leq \chi_{B_0}$, where B_0 is a ball. Here we use the convention that $\frac{1}{2}B_0$ is the scaled ball with the same center (same for cylinders). Let A denote the annulus $B_0 \setminus \frac{1}{2}B_0$. Then according to [Bog80, DcS10] there exists an Bogovskiĭ operator Bog_A from[1] $C^\infty_{0,0}(A) \to C^\infty_0(A)$ which is bounded from $L^q_0(A) \to W^{1,q}_0(A)$ for all $q \in (1,\infty)$ such that $\mathrm{div}\mathrm{Bog}_A = \mathrm{Id}$. Define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}} := \gamma \mathbf{u} - \mathrm{Bog}_A(\mathrm{div}(\gamma \mathbf{u})) = \gamma \mathbf{u} - \mathrm{Bog}_A(\nabla \gamma \cdot \mathbf{u}).$$

---

[1] $C^\infty_{0,0}$ is the subspace of C^∞_0 whose elements have mean value zero.

Then $\mathrm{div}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0$ on $I_0 \times B_0$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t) \in W_0^{1,\sigma}(B_0)$, so we can extend $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ by zero in space to $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in L^\sigma(I, W^{1,\sigma}_{\mathrm{div}}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u}$ on $I \times \frac{1}{2}B_0$, we have

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \partial_t \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{G} : \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\xi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\tfrac{1}{2}Q_0). \tag{2.2}$$

On the space $W^{1,\sigma}_{\mathrm{div}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\sigma > 1$ we define the inverse curl operator curl^{-1} by

$$\mathrm{curl}^{-1}\mathbf{g} := \mathrm{curl}(\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{g}) := \mathrm{curl}\bigg(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{-1}{4\pi|x-y|}\mathbf{g}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \bigg).$$

The definition is correct, as in the sense of distributions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{curl}(\mathrm{curl}^{-1}\mathbf{g}) &= \mathrm{curlcurl}(\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{g}) = (-\Delta + \nabla\mathrm{div})\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{g} \\
&= \mathbf{g} + \nabla\mathrm{div}\bigg(\frac{-1}{4\pi|\cdot|} * \mathbf{g} \bigg) \\
&= \mathbf{g} + \nabla\bigg(\frac{-1}{4\pi|\cdot|} * \mathrm{div}\mathbf{g} \bigg) \\
&= \mathbf{g},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\mathrm{div}\mathbf{g} = 0$ in the last step. Moreover,

$$\mathrm{div}(\mathrm{curl}^{-1}\mathbf{g}) = \mathrm{divcurl}(\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{g}) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Since $\mathbf{g} \mapsto \nabla^2(\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{g})$ is a singular integral operator, we have

$$\left\|\nabla\mathrm{curl}^{-1}\mathbf{g}\right\|_s \leq \left\|\nabla^2(\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{g})\right\|_s \leq c_s \left\|\mathbf{g}\right\|_s \tag{2.4}$$

for $s \in (1, \infty)$. Analogously, we have

$$\left\|\nabla^2\mathrm{curl}^{-1}\mathbf{g}\right\|_s \leq c_s \left\|\nabla\mathbf{g}\right\|_s \tag{2.5}$$

for $s \in (1, \infty)$.

Now, we define point wise in time

$$\mathbf{w} := \mathrm{curl}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = \mathrm{curl}^{-1}\big(\gamma\mathbf{u} - \mathrm{Bog}_{B_0 \setminus \frac{1}{2}B_0}(\nabla\gamma \cdot \mathbf{u})\big).$$

Overall, we get the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{w} &= \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u} && \text{on } \tfrac{1}{2}Q_0 \\
\mathrm{div}\mathbf{w} &= 0 && \text{on } \mathbb{R}^3
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^s(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq c_s\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|_{L^{\frac{3s}{3+s}}(B_0)}\\ \|\nabla\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^s(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq c_s\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|_{L^s(B_0)}\\ \|\nabla^2\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^s(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq c_s\,\|\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|_{L^s(B_0)}.\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in I$ *and* $s \in (1,\infty)$.

Let us derive from (2.1) the equation for $\mathbf{w}$. For $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$ we have

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \partial_t\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathrm{curl}\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{G} : \nabla\mathrm{curl}\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

We use $\mathbf{u} = \mathrm{curl}\mathbf{w}$ and partial integration to get

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \partial_t\mathbf{w}\cdot\mathrm{curl}\mathrm{curl}\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{G} : \nabla\mathrm{curl}\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Now, because

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{w}\cdot\partial_t\nabla\mathrm{div}\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int\limits_{Q_0} \mathrm{div}\mathbf{w}\,\partial_t\mathrm{div}\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = 0$$

and $\mathrm{curl}\mathrm{curl}\boldsymbol{\psi} = -\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi} + \nabla\mathrm{div}\boldsymbol{\psi}$ we gain

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{w}\cdot\partial_t\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = -\int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{G} : \nabla\mathrm{curl}\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{2.6}$$

for every $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$. We can rewrite this as

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{w}\cdot\partial_t\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = -\int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{H} : \nabla^2\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t, \tag{2.7}$$

with $|\mathbf{G}| \sim |\mathbf{H}|$ pointwise. In particular, in the sense of distributions we have $\partial_t\Delta\mathbf{w} = -\mathrm{curl}\mathrm{div}\mathbf{G} = -\mathrm{div}\mathrm{div}\mathbf{H}$.

So in passing from $\mathbf{u}$ to $\mathbf{w}$ we got a system valid for all test functions $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(Q_0)$. However, we only get control of $\partial_t\Delta\mathbf{w}$, such that the time derivative of the harmonic part of $\mathbf{w}$ cannot be seen. Hence, a parabolic Poincaré inequality for $\mathbf{w}$ still does not hold; i.e. $\partial_t\mathbf{w}$ is not controlled! In order to neckline this invariance we will replace $\mathbf{w}$ by some function $\mathbf{z}$ such that $\partial_t\Delta\mathbf{w} = \partial_t\Delta\mathbf{z}$. This will imply that $\partial_t\mathbf{z}$ can be controlled by $\mathbf{H}$. To define $\mathbf{z}$ conveniently we need some auxiliary results.

For a ball $B' \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and a function $f \in L^s(B')$ we define $\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta f$ as the weak solution $F \in W_0^{2,s}(B')$ of

$$\int_{B'} \Delta F \Delta\varphi \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{B'} f\Delta\varphi \,\mathrm{d}x \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B'). \tag{2.8}$$

Then $f - \Delta(\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta f)$ is harmonic on B'.

According to [Mül95] and [Wol07, Lemma 2.1] we have the following variational estimate.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $s \in (1,\infty)$. Then for all $g \in W_0^{2,s}(B')$ we have*

$$\|\nabla^2 g\|_s \leq c_s \sup_{\substack{\varphi\in C_0^\infty(B')\\ \|\nabla^2\varphi\|_{s'}\leq 1}} \int_{B'} \Delta g \Delta\varphi \,\mathrm{d}x$$

This implies the following two corollaries:

Corollary 2.3. *Let $s \in (1,\infty)$. Then*

$$\int_{B'} \left|\nabla^2(\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta f)\right|^s \mathrm{d}x \leq c_s \sup_{\substack{\varphi\in C_0^\infty(B')\\ \|\nabla^2\varphi\|_{s'}\leq 1}} \int_{B'} f\Delta\varphi \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c_s \int_{B'} |f|^s \,\mathrm{d}x$$

for $f \in L^s(B')$, where c_s is independent of the ball B'.

Proof. The claim follows by Lemma 2.2,

$$\int_{B'} \Delta(\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta f)\Delta\varphi \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{B'} f\Delta\varphi \,\mathrm{d}x$$

and Hölder's inequality. ☐

Corollary 2.4. *Let $s \in (1,\infty)$, then*

$$\int_{\frac{2}{3}B'} \left|\nabla^3(\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta f)\right|^s \mathrm{d}x \leq c_s \int_{B'} |\nabla f|^s \,\mathrm{d}x, \qquad \textit{for } f \in W^{1,s}(B')$$

$$\int_{\frac{2}{3}B'} \left|\nabla^4(\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta f)\right|^s \mathrm{d}x \leq c_s \int_{B'} |\nabla^2 f|^s \,\mathrm{d}x, \qquad \textit{for } f \in W^{2,s}(B'),$$

where c_s is independent of the ball B'.

Proof. The claim follows from Corollary 2.3 by standard interior regularity theory (difference quotients, localization and Poincaré). ☐

The next lemma shows the wanted control of the time derivertive.

Lemma 2.5. *For a cube $Q' = I' \times B' \subset Q_0$ let $\mathbf{z}_{Q'} := \Delta\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta\mathbf{w}$. Then for $s \in (1,\infty)$ we have*

$$\fint_{Q'} |\mathbf{z}_{Q'}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c_s \fint_{Q'} |\mathbf{w}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x$$

$$\fint_{\frac{2}{3}Q'} \left|\frac{\mathbf{z}_{Q'}}{r'}\right|^s \mathrm{d}x + \fint_{\frac{2}{3}Q'} |\nabla\mathbf{z}_{Q'}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c_s \fint_{Q'} |\nabla\mathbf{w}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x$$

$$\fint_{\frac{2}{3}Q'} \left|\frac{\mathbf{z}_{Q'}}{(r')^2}\right|^s \mathrm{d}x + \fint_{\frac{2}{3}Q'} \left|\frac{\nabla\mathbf{z}_{Q'}}{r'}\right|^s \mathrm{d}x + \fint_{\frac{2}{3}Q'} |\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_{Q'}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c_s \fint_{Q'} |\nabla^2\mathbf{w}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x,$$

$$\fint_{Q'} |\partial_t\mathbf{z}_{Q'}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \leq c_s \fint_{Q'} |\mathbf{H}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

where $r' := r_{B'}$.

Proof. The estimate of $\mathbf{z}_{Q'}$ in terms of $\mathbf{w}$ follows directly by Corollary 2.3 and integration over time.

The estimates involving $\nabla\mathbf{w}$ and $\nabla^2\mathbf{w}$ follow analogously using Corollary 2.4.

For all $\rho \in C_0^\infty(I')$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(B')$ we get by (2.7) that

$$\int_{I'}\int_{B'} \mathbf{w}\Delta\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\partial_t\rho\,\mathrm{d}t = -\int_{I'}\int_{B'} \mathbf{H} : \nabla^2\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\rho\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Let d_t^h denote the forward difference quotient in time with step size h. We use $\rho(t) := \fint_t^{t-h} \tilde{\rho}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau$ with $\tilde{\rho} \in C_0^\infty(I')$ and h sufficiently small. Then $\partial_t\rho = d_t^{-h}\tilde{\rho}$ and

$$\int_{I'}\int_{B'} \mathbf{w}\Delta\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,d_t^{-h}\tilde{\rho}\,\mathrm{d}t = -\int_{I'}\int_{B'} \mathbf{H} : \nabla^2\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x \fint_t^{t-h} \tilde{\rho}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

This implies

$$\int_{I'}\int_{B'} d_t^h\mathbf{w}\Delta\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\tilde{\rho}\,\mathrm{d}t = -\int_{I'}\int_{B'}\fint_t^{t+h} \mathbf{H}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau : \nabla^2\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\tilde{\rho}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Since this is valid for all choices of $\tilde{\rho}$ we have

$$\int_{B'} d_t^h\mathbf{w}\Delta\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x = -\int_{B'}\fint_t^{t+h} \mathbf{H}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau : \nabla^2\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Since $d_t^h \mathbf{z}_{Q'} = d_t^h(\Delta\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta\mathbf{w}) = \Delta\Delta_{B'}^{-2}\Delta(d_t^h\mathbf{w})$, it follows by Corollary 2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}\Bigg(\int\limits_{B'} |d_t^h \mathbf{z}_{Q'}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}} &\le c \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\varphi}\in C_0^\infty(B)\\ \|\nabla^2\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{s'}\le 1}} \int\limits_{B'} d_t^h \mathbf{w}\Delta\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\varphi}\in C_0^\infty(B)\\ \|\nabla^2\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{s'}\le 1}} \Bigg(-\int\limits_{B'} \fint\limits_{t}^{t+h} \mathbf{H}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau : \nabla^2\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\Bigg) \\ &\le c\Bigg(\int\limits_{B'}\fint\limits_{t}^{t+h} |\mathbf{H}(\tau)|^s \,\mathrm{d}\tau\,\mathrm{d}x\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}}.\end{aligned}$$

Integration over time and passing to the limit $h \to 0$ proves

$$\Bigg(\int\limits_{Q'} |\partial_t \mathbf{z}_{Q'}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}} \le c\Bigg(\int\limits_{Q'} |\mathbf{H}|^s \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}}. \qquad \square$$

We define $\mathbf{z}(t) := \mathbf{z}_{\frac{1}{2}Q_0}(t) = \Delta\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}B_0}^{-2}\Delta\mathbf{w}(t)$ for $t \in \frac{1}{2}I_0$, then

$$\int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{z}\cdot\partial_t\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{w}\cdot\partial_t\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = -\int\limits_{Q_0} \mathbf{H} : \nabla^2\boldsymbol{\psi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t, \tag{2.9}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$. Since $\Delta_{\frac{1}{2}B_0}^{-2}\mathbf{w}(t) \in W_0^{2,s}(\frac{1}{2}B_0)$, we can extend it by zero to a function from $W^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. In this sense it is natural to extend $\mathbf{z}(t)$ by zero to a function $L^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Note that Lemma 2.5 enables us to control $\partial_t\mathbf{z}$ by $\mathbf{H}$ in $L^s(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$.

Lemma 2.6. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{z}(t)\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{3}B_0)} &\le c_s\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|_{L^{\frac{3s}{s+3}}(B_0)} \\ \|\nabla\mathbf{z}(t)\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{3}B_0)} &\le c_s\,\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|_{L^s(B_0)} \\ \|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}(t)\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{3}B_0)} &\le c_s\,\|\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t)\|_{L^s(B_0)}.\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in I$ and $s \in (1,\infty)$.

Proof. This follows from Corollary 2.3, Corollary 2.4 and Lemma 2.1. $\square$

Let $\alpha > 0$. We say that $Q' = I'\times B' \subset \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^3$ is an α-parabolic cylinder if $r_{I'} = \alpha\, r_{B'}^2$. For $\kappa > 0$ we define the scaled cylinder $\kappa Q' := (\kappa I')\times(\kappa B')$. By

$\mathcal{Q}^\alpha$ we denote the set of all α-parabolic cylinders. We define the α-parabolic maximal operator $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{M}^\alpha_s$ for $s \in [1,\infty)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{M}^\alpha f)(t,x) &:= \sup_{(t,x)\ni Q'\,:\,Q'\in\mathcal{Q}^\alpha} \fint_{Q'} |f(\tau,y)|\,\mathrm{d}\tau\,\mathrm{d}y,\\ \mathcal{M}^\alpha_s f(t,x) &:= \big(\mathcal{M}^\alpha(|f|^s(t,x))\big)^{\frac{1}{s}}\end{aligned}$$

It is standard (see e.g. [Ste93]) that for all $q \in (s,\infty]$

$$\|\mathcal{M}^\alpha_s f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq c\,\|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}. \tag{2.10}$$

For $\lambda, \alpha > 0$ and $\sigma > 1$ we define

$$\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda := \{\mathcal{M}^\alpha_\sigma(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}|) > \lambda\} \cup \{\alpha\mathcal{M}^\alpha_\sigma(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}|) > \lambda\}. \tag{2.11}$$

Later we will choose $\alpha = \lambda^{2-p}$ and σ smaller than the integrability exponent of $\mathbf{H}$.

We want to redefine $\mathbf{z}$ on $\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$. The first step is to cover $\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$ by well selected cubes. By the lower-semi-continuity property of the maximal functions the set $\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$ is open. We assume in the following that $\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$ is non-empty. (In the case that $\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$ is empty, we do not need to truncate at all.)

According to [DRW10, Lemma 3.1] there exists an α-parabolic Whitney covering $\{Q_i\}$ of $\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$ in the following sense:

(PW1) $\bigcup_i \frac{1}{2}Q_i = \mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$,

(PW2) for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $8Q_i \subset \mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$ and $16Q_i \cap (\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda) \neq \emptyset$,

(PW3) if $Q_i \cap Q_j \neq \emptyset$ then $\frac{1}{2}r_j \leq r_i < 2\,r_j$,

(PW4) at every point at most 120^{n+2} of the sets $4Q_i$ intersect,

where $r_i := r_{B_i}$, the radius of B_i and $Q_i = I_i \times B_i$.

For each Q_i we define $A_i := \{j \,:\, Q_j \cap Q_i \neq \emptyset\}$. Note that $\#A_i \leq 120^{n+2}$ and $r_j \sim r_i$ for all $j \in A_i$. With respect to the covering $\{Q_i\}$ there exists a partition of unity $\{\varphi_i\} \subset C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ such that

(PP1) $\chi_{\frac{1}{2}Q_i} \leq \varphi_i \leq \chi_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i}$,

(PP2) $\sum_j \varphi_j = \sum_{j\in A_i} \varphi_j = 1$ on Q_i,

(PP3) $|\varphi_i| + r_i|\nabla\varphi_i| + r_i^2|\nabla^2\varphi_i| + \alpha\,r_i^2|\partial_t\varphi_i| \leq c$.

Due to property (PW3) we have that $16Q_j \cap (\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, the definition of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha$ implies that

$$\Big(\fint_{16Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}|^\sigma \chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \leq \lambda, \tag{2.12}$$

$$\alpha \Big(\fint_{16Q_j} |\mathbf{H}|^\sigma \chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \leq \lambda. \tag{2.13}$$

Lemma 2.7. *Assume that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that $\lambda^p |\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha| \leq c_0$ with $p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$. Then the following holds:*

If $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 = \lambda_0(c_0)$, $\alpha = \lambda^{2-p}$ and $Q_i \cap \frac{1}{4}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$, then $Q_i \subset \frac{1}{3}Q_0$ and $Q_j \subset \frac{1}{3}Q_0$ for all $j \in A_i$.

Proof. Let $Q_i \cap \frac{1}{4}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$. We claim that $Q_i \subset \frac{7}{24}Q_0 \subset \frac{1}{3}Q_0$. Let $s_i := \alpha r_i^2$. It suffices to show that $r_i, s_i \to 0$ for $\lambda \to \infty$. Because $Q_i \subset \mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha$ and by Assumption, we find

$$\lambda^2 r_i^{n+2} = \lambda^p s_i r_i^n \leq \lambda^p |Q_i| \leq \lambda^p |\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha| \leq c_0. \tag{2.14}$$

This implies $r_i \leq (c\,c_0 \lambda^{-2})^{\frac{1}{n+2}} \to 0$ for $\lambda \to \infty$. Moreover, $r_i = s_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and (2.14) imply

$$c\,c_0 \geq \lambda^p s_i r_i^n = \lambda^p s_i^{\frac{n+2}{2}} \alpha^{-\frac{3}{2}} = \lambda^{\frac{n+2}{2}p - n} s_i^{\frac{n+2}{2}}.$$

If $p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$, then $\lambda \to \infty$ implies $s_i \to 0$ as desired.

The claim on $j \in A_i$ follows by the fact that Q_i and Q_j have comparable size and that $\frac{7}{24}Q_0$ is strictly contained in $\frac{1}{3}Q_0$. ☐

Let us show that the assumption $\lambda^p |\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha| \leq c_0$ from Lemma 2.7 is satisfied in our situation. For this we assume from now on that

$$\alpha := \lambda^{2-p} \tag{2.15}$$

and that $\sigma < \min\{p, p'\}$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $c_0 := \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}^p + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^{p'}(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}^{p'}$. Then*

$$\lambda^p |\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha| \leq c_0.$$

Proof. If follows from the weak-type estimate of $\mathcal{M}_\sigma^\alpha$, provided $\sigma < \min\{p, p'\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha| &\leq c\,\lambda^{-p} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}^p + c\,(\lambda\alpha^{-1})^{-p'} \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^{p'}(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}^{p'} \\ &= c\,\lambda^{-p} \big(\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}^p + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^{p'}(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}^{p'} \big). \end{aligned}$$

☐

In the following we define λ_0 such that the conclusion of Lemma 2.7 is valid and assume $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. Without loss of generality we can assume further that

$$\lambda_0 \geq \bigg(\fint_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}|^\sigma \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + r_0^{-2} \bigg(\fint_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} |\mathbf{z}|^\sigma \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}. \tag{2.16}$$

We define

$$\mathcal{I} := \{ i \,:\, Q_i \cap \tfrac{1}{4} Q_0 \neq \emptyset \}.$$

Then Lemma 2.7 implies $Q_i \subset \frac{1}{3}Q_0$ (and $Q_j \subset \frac{1}{3}Q_0$ for $j \in A_i$) for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. For each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ we define $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{h}_i \,:\, Q_i \to \mathbb{R}^3$ using (2.8) pointwise in time and componentwise in space by

$$\mathbf{z}_i := \Delta \Delta_{B_i}^{-2} \Delta \mathbf{z} = \Delta \Delta_{B_i}^{-2} \Delta \mathbf{w}, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\mathbf{h}_i := \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}_i. \tag{2.18}$$

In particular, we have $\Delta \mathbf{h}_i = 0$ on B_i, $\mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{z}$ on $I_i \times \partial B_i$ and

$$\int_{B_i} \mathbf{z}_i \Delta \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, \mathrm{d}x = \int_{B_i} \mathbf{z} \Delta \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, \mathrm{d}x = \int_{B_i} \mathbf{w} \Delta \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, \mathrm{d}x \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C_0^\infty(B_i). \tag{2.19}$$

So the functions $\mathbf{h}_i$ are local, harmonic approximations of $\mathbf{z}$ (which is the part of $\mathbf{w}$ which needs to be controlled).

We can now define our truncation $\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha$ for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ on $\frac{1}{4}Q_0$ by

$$\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha := \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \varphi_i \mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{z} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \varphi_i (\mathbf{h}_i - \mathbf{z}). \tag{2.20}$$

It suffices to sum over i with $Q_i \cap \frac{1}{4}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$.

Since the φ_i are locally finite, this sum is pointwise well-defined. We will see later that the sum converges also in other topologies. Using $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \varphi_i = 1$ on $\frac{1}{4}Q_0$, we can write $\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha$ also in the following form.

$$\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha = \begin{cases} \mathbf{z} & \text{on } \frac{1}{4}Q_0 \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha, \\ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \varphi_i \mathbf{h}_i & \text{on } \frac{1}{4}Q_0 \cap \mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha. \end{cases} \tag{2.21}$$

In the following we provide some qualities of the truncation (e.g. $\Delta \mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha \in L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$). We begin by proving the stability of the truncation.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $1 < s < \infty$ and $\mathbf{z} \in L^s(\mathbb{R}; W^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Then it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)} &\leq c \, \|\mathbf{z}\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}, \\ \|\nabla \mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)} &\leq c \, \|\nabla \mathbf{z}\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}. \\ \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)} &\leq c \, \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the sum in $\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \varphi_i \mathbf{z}_i$ in (2.20) converges in $L^s(\frac{1}{4}I_0, W^{2,s}(\frac{1}{4}B_0))$.

Proof. We start with the representation

$$\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha=\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\varphi_i\mathbf{z}_i.$$

We show first that the sum converges absolutely in $L^p(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$.

$$\int\limits_{\frac{1}{4}Q_0}|\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\le\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\int\limits_{Q_i}|\mathbf{z}_j|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\le c\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\int\limits_{Q_i}|\mathbf{z}|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\le c\int\limits_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{z}|^s\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

where we used Lemma 2.5, (PP1) and the finite intersection property of Q_i (PW4).

We have pointwise on $\frac{1}{4}Q_0\cap\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha$

$$\nabla(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha)=\nabla\Big(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\varphi_i\mathbf{z}_i\Big)=\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\big(\nabla\varphi_i\mathbf{z}_i+\varphi_i\nabla\mathbf{z}_i\big).$$

All sums are just finite sums, since the family Q_i is locally finite. Every summand in the last sum belong to L^s. We show that $\|\nabla(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha)\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)}\le c\,\|\nabla\mathbf{z}\|_{L^s(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}$, which also proves the convergence of the sum in (2.20) in $L^s(\frac{1}{4}I_0,W^{1,s}(\frac{1}{4}B_0))$. We estimate with Lemma 2.5 and the locally finiteness of the Q_i.

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{\frac{1}{4}Q_0}|\nabla(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha)|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t&\le c\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\int\limits_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i}\left|\frac{\mathbf{z}_i}{r_i}\right|^s\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+c\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\int\limits_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i}|\nabla\mathbf{z}_i|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\&\le c\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\int\limits_{Q_i}|\nabla\mathbf{z}|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\&\le c\int\limits_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla\mathbf{z}|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t.\end{aligned}$$

The estimate involving $\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha$ and $\nabla^2\mathbf{z}$ follows analogously. □

The truncation $\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha$ has better regularity properties than $\mathbf{z}$; indeed, $\nabla\mathbf{z}$ is “almost Lipschitz”.

Lemma 2.10. *We have for $\lambda\ge\lambda_0$*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)}&\le c\,\lambda,\\\|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}I_0;\mathrm{BMO}(\frac{1}{5}Q_0))}&\le c\,\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We start with the estimate on $\Delta\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha$:

On $\frac{1}{4}Q_0\setminus\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha$ we have $|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}|\le\mathcal{M}_\sigma^\alpha(|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}|\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0})\le\lambda$. Since $\mathbf{z}=\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha$ on $\frac{1}{4}Q_0\setminus\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha$, we get $\|\Delta\mathbf{z}_\lambda^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0\setminus\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\alpha)}\le\lambda$. Since the family $\{\frac{1}{2}Q_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ covers

$\frac{1}{4}Q_0 \cap \mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda$, it remains to prove $\|\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\frac{2}{3}Q_i)} \le c\,\lambda$ for every $i \in \mathcal{I}$. On $\frac{2}{3}Q_i$ we estimate

$$\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda = \Delta\bigg(\sum_{j\in A_i} \varphi_j \mathbf{h}_j\bigg) = \sum_{j\in A_i} \Delta\left(\varphi_j\left(\mathbf{h}_j - \mathbf{h}_i\right)\right).$$

The properties of φ_j and the fact that $r_j \sim r_i$ (PW3) for $j \in A_i$ imply

$$\sup_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i} |\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda| \le c \sum_{j\in A_i} \sup_{t\in\frac{2}{3}I_i\cap\frac{2}{3}I_j} \left(\sup_{x\in\frac{2}{3}B_i\cap\frac{2}{3}B_j} \left|\frac{\mathbf{h}_j - \mathbf{h}_i}{r_j^2}\right| + \sup_{x\in\frac{2}{3}B_i\cap\frac{2}{3}B_j} \left|\frac{\nabla(\mathbf{h}_j - \mathbf{h}_i)}{r_j}\right| \right).$$

It follows by the interior regularity properties of harmonic functions that

$$\sup_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i} |\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda| \le c \sum_{j\in A_i} \sup_{\frac{2}{3}I_i\cap\frac{2}{3}I_j} \fint_{B_i\cap B_j} \frac{1}{r_i^2} |\mathbf{h}_j - \mathbf{h}_i| \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Since $\mathbf{h}_j - \mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{z}_j - \mathbf{z}_i$ and $j \in A_i$ we have

$$\sup_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i} |\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda| \le c \sum_{j\in A_i} \sup_{I_j} \fint_{B_j} \left|\frac{\mathbf{z}_j}{r_j^2}\right| \mathrm{d}x.$$

The one-dimensional Sobolev-Poincaré inequality on I_j, the parabolic scaling $r_{I_j} = \alpha r_{B_j}^2$ and Jensen's inequality give

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i} |\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda| &\le c \sum_{j\in A_i} \left(\fint_{Q_j} \left|\frac{\mathbf{z}_j}{r_j^2}\right| \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \alpha \fint_{Q_j} |\partial_t \mathbf{z}_j| \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \right) \\ &\le c \sum_{j\in A_i} \left(\bigg(\fint_{Q_j} \left|\frac{\mathbf{z}_j}{r_j^2}\right|^\sigma \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + \alpha \bigg(\fint_{Q_j} |\partial_t \mathbf{z}_j|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

An application of Lemma 2.5, (2.12) and (2.13) imply for $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$

$$\sup_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i} |\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda| \le c \sum_{j\in A_i} \left(\bigg(\fint_{Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + \alpha \bigg(\fint_{Q_j} |\mathbf{H}|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \right) \le c\,\lambda.$$

Overall, we have shown $\|\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)} \le c\lambda$. The boundedness of $f \mapsto \nabla^2\Delta^{-1}$ from $L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}B_0)$ to $\mathrm{BMO}(\frac{1}{5}B_0)$, Lemma 2.9, (2.16) and $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$ imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda(t)\|_{\mathrm{BMO}(\frac{1}{5}B_0)} &\le c\|\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda(t)\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}B_0)} + c \bigg(\fint_{\frac{1}{4}Q_0} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \\ &\le c\|\Delta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda(t)\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}B_0)} + c \bigg(\fint_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \\ &\le c\,\lambda + c\,\lambda_0 \le c\,\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

for almost all $t \in \frac{1}{4}I_0$, which proves the claim. ☐

The core of the presented way to truncate a function is that we can control its timederivative. We first show it is well defined.

Lemma 2.11. *For all $s \in (1,\infty)$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$*

$$\alpha\, \|\partial_t(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda)\|_{L^s(\frac14 Q_0)} \leq c\,\big(\|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}\|_{L^s(\frac13 Q_0)} + \alpha\,\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^s(\frac13 Q_0)}\big).$$

Moreover, $\partial_t(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\partial_t(\varphi_i\mathbf{z}_i)$ with convergence in $L^s(\frac14 Q_0)$.

Proof. We estimate

$$\int \Big|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\partial_t(\varphi_i\mathbf{z}_i)\Big|^s \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \leq c\sum_i\sum_{j\in A_i}\int\limits_{Q_j}|\partial_t(\varphi_j\mathbf{z}_j)|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

where we used (PW4). The estimates on φ_j and $\mathbf{z}_j$ in Lemma 2.5 imply

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{Q_i}|\partial_t(\varphi_i\mathbf{z}_i)|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t &\leq c\sum_{j\in A_i}\bigg(\int\limits_{\frac23 Q_j}\Big|\frac{\mathbf{z}_j}{\alpha r_j^2}\Big|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_{\frac23 Q_j}|\partial_t\mathbf{z}_j|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\bigg)\\ &\leq c\sum_{j\in A_i}\bigg(\alpha^{-s}\int\limits_{Q_j}|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_{Q_j}|\mathbf{H}|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\bigg).\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

This and the previous inequality imply

$$\int\Big|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\partial_t(\varphi_i\mathbf{z}_i)\Big|^s\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \leq c\,\alpha^{-s}\|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}\|^s_{L^s(\frac13 Q_0)} + c\|\mathbf{H}\|^s_{L^s(\frac13 Q_0)}.$$

This proves the estimate and also the convergence of the sum. ☐

The next lemma will control the time error we get when we apply the truncation as a test function.

Lemma 2.12. *For all $\zeta\in C_0^\infty(\frac14 Q_0)$ with $\|\nabla^2\zeta\|_\infty\leq c$ and $\lambda\geq\lambda_0$*

$$\bigg|\int\limits_{\frac14 Q_0}\partial_t\big(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda\big)\,\Delta(\zeta\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\bigg| \leq c\,\alpha^{-1}\lambda^2\,|\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda|,$$

where the constant c is independent of α and λ.

Proof. We estimate with Lemma 2.10, Lemma 2.9 and $\lambda\geq\lambda_0$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta(\zeta\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda)\|_{L^{\sigma'}(\frac14 Q_0)} &\leq c\,\|\Delta\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda\|_{L^{\sigma'}(\frac14 Q_0)} + c\,r_0^{-2}\|\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda\|_{L^1(\frac14 Q_0)}\\ &\leq c\,\lambda + c\,r_0^{-2}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{L^\sigma(\frac13 Q_0)}\\ &\leq c\,\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Using $\partial_t(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \partial_t(\varphi_i \mathbf{z}_i)$ in $L^s(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)$, Jensen's inequality and the previous gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(I) &:= \bigg| \int\limits_{\frac{1}{4}Q_0} \partial_t\big(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda\big)\, \Delta(\zeta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda)\, \mathrm{d}x\, \mathrm{d}t \bigg| \\
&\leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \bigg(\int\limits_{Q_i} \big|\partial_t(\varphi_i \mathbf{z}_i)\big|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \bigg(\int\limits_{Q_i} |\Delta(\zeta \mathbf{z}^\alpha_\lambda)|^{\sigma'} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma'}} \\
&\leq c\,\lambda \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |Q_i| \bigg(⨍\limits_{Q_i} \big|\partial_t(\varphi_i \mathbf{z}_i)\big|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}.
\end{aligned}$$

With (2.22), (2.12) and (2.13) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(I) &\leq c\,\lambda \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |Q_i| \bigg(\bigg(\alpha^{-1} \bigg(⨍\limits_{Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} + \bigg(⨍\limits_{Q_j} |\mathbf{H}|^\sigma \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \bigg) \\
&\leq c\,\alpha^{-1}\lambda^2 \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |Q_i| \leq c\,\alpha^{-1}\lambda^2 |\mathcal{O}^\alpha_\lambda|,
\end{aligned}$$

using in the last step the locally finiteness of the $\{Q_i\}$. $\square$

Theorem 2.13. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ with $p, p' > \sigma$. Let $\mathbf{w}_m$ and $\mathbf{H}_m$ satisfy $\partial_t \Delta \mathbf{w}_m = -\mathrm{divdiv}\mathbf{H}_m$ in the sense of distributions $\mathcal{D}'(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$, see (2.7). Further assume that $\mathbf{w}_m$ is a weak null sequence in $L^p(\frac{1}{2}I_0; W^{2,p}(\frac{1}{2}B_0))$ and a strong null sequence in $L^\sigma(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$. Further, assume that $\mathbf{H}_m = \mathbf{H}_{1,m} + \mathbf{H}_{2,m}$ such that $\mathbf{H}_{1,m}$ is a weak null sequence in $L^{p'}(Q_0)$ and $\mathbf{H}_{2,m}$ converges strongly to zero in $L^\sigma(Q_0)$. Define $\mathbf{z}_m := \Delta\Delta^{-2}_{\frac{1}{2}B_0}\Delta\mathbf{w}_m$ pointwise in time on $\frac{1}{2}I_0$. Then there is a double sequence $(\lambda_{m,k}) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

- *(a)* $2^{2^k} \leq \lambda_{m,k} \leq 2^{2^{k+1}}$

such that the double sequence $\mathbf{z}_{m,k} := \mathbf{z}^{\alpha_{m,k}}_{\lambda_{m,k}}$ with $\alpha_{m,k} := \lambda^{2-p}_{m,k}$ satisfies the following properties for all $k \geq k_0$

- *(b)* $\{\mathbf{z}_{m,k} \neq \mathbf{z}\} \subset \mathcal{O}_{m,k} := \mathcal{O}^{\alpha_{m,k}}_{\lambda_{m,k}}$,
- *(c)* $\|\Delta \mathbf{z}_{m,k}\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)} \leq c\,\lambda_{m,k}$,
- *(d)* $\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k}\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}I_0, \mathrm{BMO}(\frac{1}{5}B_0))} \leq c\,\lambda_{m,k}$,
- *(e)* $\mathbf{z}_{m,k} \to 0$ *and* $\nabla \mathbf{z}_{m,k} \to 0$ *in* $L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$ *for* $m \to \infty$ *and* k *fixed.*
- *(f)* $\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k} \rightharpoonup 0$ *in* $L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$ *for all* $s < \infty$ *for* $m \to \infty$ *and* k *fixed.*

(g) *We have* $\limsup\limits_{m\to\infty} \big\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k}\chi_{\mathcal{O}_{m,k}}\big\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{5}Q_0)} \leq c\left(\lambda^p_{m,k}|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}|\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

(h) *We have for all* $\zeta \in C^\infty_0(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$

$$\left|\int \big(\partial_t\big(\mathbf{z}_m - \mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\big)\,\Delta(\zeta\mathbf{z}_{m,k})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,\lambda^p_{m,k}|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}|,$$

(i) $\limsup\limits_{m\to\infty} \lambda^p_{m,k}|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}| \leq c\,2^{-k}\sup\limits_m(\|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_m\|_p + c\,\|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}\|_{p'}^{\frac{1}{p-1}})$.

Proof. Let us assume that $\lambda_{m,k}$ satisfies (a). We will choose the precise values of $\lambda_{m,k}$ later. Due to Lemma 2.5 we have $\mathbf{z}_m \rightharpoonup 0$ in $L^p(\frac{1}{4}I_0; W^{2,p}(\frac{1}{4}B_0))$; this is due to the fact that the operator $\mathbf{w} \mapsto \Delta\Delta^{-2}_{\frac{1}{2}B_0}\Delta\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{z}$ is linear and continuous in $L^p(\frac{1}{4}I_0; W^{2,p}(\frac{1}{4}B_0))$. Then the properties (b), (c) and (d) follow from Lemma 2.10. Moreover, Corollar 2.3 ensures that the strong convergence in $L^\sigma(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$ transfers from $\mathbf{w}_m$ to $\mathbf{z}_m$. By Lemma 2.9 we get the same for $\mathbf{z}_{m,k}$ (fixed k). Also due to (c) the sequence $\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_{m,k}$ is for fixed k and s bounded in $L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$. The combination of these convergence properties implies by interpolation (e). Moreover, the boundedness of $\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_{m,k}$ in $L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$ implies the weak convergence of a subsequence. Since (e) ensures that the limit is zero, we get by the usual arguments the weak convergence of the whole sequence. This proves (f). Moreover, (h) follows by Lemma 2.12 and the choice of $\alpha_{m,k}$.

The claim of (g) is a consequence of the following calculations for $\mathbf{K} \in L^{p'}(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$: Let M and $M^\sharp$ define the space maximal functions

$$(Mf)(x) := \sup_{B\ni x} \fint_B |f|\,\mathrm{d}y, \qquad (M^\sharp f)(x) := \sup_{B\ni x}\fint_B |f - \langle f\rangle_B|\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Then by [Ste93, IV, Section 2] we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int \mathbf{K} : \nabla^2\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\chi_{\mathcal{O}^{\alpha_{m,k}}_{\lambda_{m,k}}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| &\leq \sum_i \int \chi_{\frac{1}{6}Q_0}|\mathbf{K}||\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_{m,k}|\chi_{Q_i}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &\leq c\sum_i\int M\big(\chi_{Q_i\cap\frac{1}{6}Q_0}|\mathbf{K}|\big)M^\sharp\big(|\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_{m,k}|\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t.\end{aligned}$$

Using (d) and the $L^{p'}$-boundedness of M we prove (g) by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bigg| \int \mathbf{K} : \nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k} \chi_{\mathcal{O}_{m,k}} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg| &\le c\,\lambda_{m.k} \sum_i \int M\big(\chi_{Q_i \cap \frac{1}{6}Q_0} |\mathbf{K}|\big) \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\le c\,\lambda_{m.k} \sum_i |Q_i|^{\frac{1}{p}} \bigg(\int M\big(\chi_{Q_i \cap \frac{1}{6}Q_0} |\mathbf{K}|\big)^{p'} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{p}'} \\
&\le c\,\lambda_{m.k} \sum_i |Q_i|^{\frac{1}{p}} \bigg(\int\limits_{\frac{1}{6}Q_0} |\mathbf{K}|^{p'} \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \bigg)^{\frac{1}{p}'} \\
&\le c\,\|\mathbf{K}\|_{L^{p'}(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)} \Big(\lambda_{m,k}^p |\mathcal{O}_{m,k}| \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

It remains to choose $2^{2^k} \le \lambda_{m,k} \le 2^{2^{k+1}}$ such that (i) holds. We divide

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{m,k} &= \{\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k}|) > \lambda_{m,k}\} \cup \{\alpha_{m,k}\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_m|) > \lambda_{m,k}\} \\
&\subset \{\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k}|) > \lambda_{m,k}\} \cup \{\alpha_{m,k}\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}|) > \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda_{m,k}\} \\
&\quad \cup \{\alpha_{m,k}\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_{2,m}|) > \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda_{m,k}\} \\
&=: I \cup II \cup III.
\end{aligned}
$$

Define

$$
g_m := \mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_m|) + \Big(2\,\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}|)\Big)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.
$$

Then by the boundedness of $\mathcal{M}_\sigma$ on L^p and $L^{p'}$ (using $p, p' > \sigma$) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|g_m\|_p &\le \big\|\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_m|)\big\|_p + \big\|(2\,\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}|))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\big\|_p \\
&= \big\|\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_m|)\big\|_p + \big\|2\,\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}|)\big\|_{p'}^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \\
&\le c\,\big\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_m\big\|_p + c\,\big\|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}\big\|_{p'}^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $K := \sup_m(\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_m\|_p + c\,\|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}\|_{p'}^{\frac{1}{p-1}})$. In particular, $\|g_m\|_p \le K$ uniformly in k. Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
I \cup II &= \{\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k}|) > \lambda_{m,k}\} \cup \{(\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}|))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} > \lambda_{m,k}\} \\
&\subset \{\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\nabla^2 \mathbf{z}_{m,k}|) + (2\,\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0}|\mathbf{H}_m|))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} > \lambda_{m,k}\} \\
&= \{g_m > \lambda_{m,k}\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} |g_m|^p \,\mathrm{d}x &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \int\limits_0^\infty \frac{1}{p} t^{p-1} \chi_{\{|g_m|>t\}} \,\mathrm{d}t \,\mathrm{d}x \geq \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{p} 2^k \chi_{\{|g_m|>2^{k+1}\}} \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{k=2^j}^{2^{j+1}-1} \frac{1}{p} 2^{kp} |\{|g_m| > 2^{k+1}\}|.\end{aligned}$$

For fixed m, j the sum over k involves 2^j summands and not all of them can be large. Consequently there exists $\lambda_{m,k} \in \{2^{2^k+1}, \dots, 2^{2^{k+1}}\}$, such that

$$\lambda_{m,k}^p \big|\{|g_m| > \lambda_{m,k}\}\big| \;\leq\; c\, 2^{-k}\, K^p$$

uniformly in m and k. This proves

$$\lambda_{m,k}^p \big|I \cup II\big| \leq \lambda_{m,k}^p \big|\{g_m > \lambda_{m,k}\}\big| \leq c\, 2^{-k} K^p. \tag{2.23}$$

On the other hand estimate with the weak-L^σ estimate for $\mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}$ we gain

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{m\to\infty} \Big(\lambda_{m,k}^p |III|\Big) &= \limsup_{m\to\infty} \Big(\lambda_{m,k}^p \big|\{\alpha_{m,k} \mathcal{M}_\sigma^{\alpha_{m,k}}(\chi_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} |\mathbf{H}_{2,m}|) > \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda_{m,k}\}\big|\Big) \\ &\leq \limsup_{m\to\infty} \Big(c\, \lambda_{m,k}^p \big\|\mathbf{H}_{2,m}\big\|_{L^\sigma(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)}^\sigma (\alpha_{m,k}/\lambda_{m,k})^\sigma\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Since $2^{2^k+1} \leq \lambda_{m,k} \leq 2^{2^{k+1}}$, $\alpha_{m,k} = \lambda_{m,k}^{2-p}$ and $\mathbf{H}^{2,m} \to 0$ in $L^\sigma(\frac{1}{3}Q_0)$, it follows that

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty} \Big(\lambda_{m,k}^p |III|\Big) = 0.$$

This and (2.23) prove (i). ☐

Theorem 2.14. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ with $p, p' > \sigma$. Let $\mathbf{u}_m$ and $\mathbf{G}_m$ satisfy $\partial_t \mathbf{u}_m = -\mathrm{div}\mathbf{G}_m$ in the sense of distributions $\mathcal{D}'_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_0)$. Assume that $\mathbf{u}_m$ is a weak null sequence in $L^p(I_0; W^{1,p}(B_0))$ and a strong null sequence in $L^\sigma(Q_0)$. Further assume that $\mathbf{G}_m = \mathbf{G}_{1,m} + \mathbf{G}_{2,m}$ such that $\mathbf{G}_{1,m}$ is a weak null sequence in $L^{p'}(Q_0)$ and $\mathbf{G}_{2,m}$ converges strongly to zero in $L^\sigma(Q_0)$. Then there is a double sequence $(\lambda_{m,k}) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with*

(a) $2^{2^k} \leq \lambda_{m,k} \leq 2^{2^{k+1}}$

such that the double sequences $\mathbf{u}_{m,k} := \mathbf{u}_{\lambda_{m,k}}^{\alpha_{m,k}} \in L^1(Q_0)$, $\alpha_{m,k} := \lambda_{m,k}^{2-p}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{m,k} := \mathcal{O}_{\lambda_{m,k}}^{\alpha_{m,k}}$ (defined in Theorem 2.13) satisfy the following properties for all $k \geq k_0$

(b) $\mathbf{u}_{m,k} \in L^s(\frac{1}{4}I_0; W^{1,s}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\frac{1}{6}B_0))$ *for all $s < \infty$ and* $\mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{u}_{m,k}) \subset \frac{1}{6}Q_0$.

(c) $\mathbf{u}_{m,k} = \mathbf{u}_m$ *a.e. on* $\frac{1}{8}Q_0 \setminus \mathcal{O}_{m,k}$.

(d) $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_{m,k}\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}I_0,\mathrm{BMO}(\frac{1}{5}B_0))} \leq c\,\lambda_{m,k}$,

(e) $\mathbf{u}_{m,k} \to 0$ *in* $L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$ *for* $m \to \infty$ *and* k *fixed.*

(f) $\nabla \mathbf{u}_{m,k} \rightharpoonup 0$ *in* $L^s(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$ *for all* $s < \infty$ *for* $m \to \infty$ *and* k *fixed.*

(g) $\limsup\limits_{m\to\infty} \lambda^p_{m,k}|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}| \leq c\,2^{-k}$.

(h) We have $\limsup\limits_{m\to\infty} \big\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_{m,k}\chi_{\mathcal{O}_{m,k}}\big\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)} \leq c\left(\lambda^p_{m,k}|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}|\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

(i) $\limsup\limits_{m\to\infty}\left|\int \mathbf{G}_m : \nabla \mathbf{u}_{m,k}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,\lambda^p_{m,k}|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}|$

Proof. We define pointwise in time on I_0

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_m &:= \gamma \mathbf{u}_m - \mathrm{Bog}_{B_0\setminus\frac{1}{2}B_0}(\nabla\gamma\cdot\mathbf{u}_m),\\
\mathbf{w}_m &:= \mathrm{curl}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_m,\\
\mathbf{z}_m &:= \Delta\Delta^{-2}_{\frac{1}{2}Q_0}\Delta \mathbf{w}_m,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma \in C^\infty_0(Q_0)$ with $\chi_{\frac{1}{2}Q_0} \leq \gamma \leq \chi_{Q_0}$. Then we apply Theorem 2.13 to the sequence $\mathbf{z}_m$. Finally, let

$$\mathbf{u}_{m,k} := \mathrm{curl}(\zeta \mathbf{z}_{m,k}) + \mathrm{curl}(\zeta(\mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{z}_m)), \tag{2.24}$$

where $\zeta \in C^\infty_0(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ with $\chi_{\frac{1}{8}Q_0} \leq \zeta \leq \chi_{\frac{1}{6}Q_0}$. This means on $\frac{1}{8}Q_0$ we have

$$\mathbf{u}_{m,k} = \mathbf{u}_m + \mathrm{curl}(\mathbf{z}_{m,k} - \mathbf{z}_m).$$

Note that $\mathrm{curl}(\mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{z}_m)$ is harmonic (in space) on $\frac{1}{2}Q_0$. This allows us to estimate the higher order spaces derivatives on $\frac{1}{4}Q_0$ by lower order ones on $\frac{1}{2}Q_0$. This, (2.24) and Theorem 2.13 immediately imply all claimed properties except of (h) and (i).

The claim of (h) follows exactly as (g) in Theorem 2.13.

Let us prove (i). It follows by simple density arguments, that $\mathbf{u}_{m,k}$ is an admissible test function for the equation $\partial_t \mathbf{u}_m = -\mathrm{div}\mathbf{G}_m$. We thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \mathbf{G}_m : \nabla \mathbf{u}_{m,k}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad= \int \partial_t \mathbf{u}_m\,\mathbf{u}_{m,k}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad= \int \big(\partial_t \mathrm{curl}\mathbf{w}_m\big)\mathrm{curl}\big(\zeta \mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int \big(\partial_t \mathrm{curl}\mathbf{w}_m\big)\mathrm{curl}\big(\zeta\big(\mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{z}_m\big)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad= -\int \big(\partial_t \mathbf{z}_m\big)\Delta\big(\zeta \mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t - \int \big(\partial_t \mathbf{z}_m\big)\Delta\big(\zeta\big(\mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{z}_m\big)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\quad=: T_1 + T_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we took into account $\operatorname{curlcurl}\mathbf{w}_m = -\Delta\mathbf{w}_m$ (due to $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{w}_m = 0$) and $\Delta\mathbf{w}_m = \Delta\mathbf{z}_m$. By assumption $\mathbf{G}_m$ is bounded in $L^\sigma(Q_0)$.

Using regularity properties of harmonic functions (for $\mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{z}_m$) as well as Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.1 we get (after choosing a subsequence)

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\fint_{Q_0} \big|\Delta\big(\zeta\big(\mathbf{w}_m-\mathbf{z}_m\big)\big|^{\sigma'}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma'}} &\le c\,r_0^{-2}\Big(\fint_{\frac{1}{4}Q_0} \big|\mathbf{w}_m-\mathbf{z}_m\big|^{\frac{3\sigma}{3+\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{3+\sigma}{3\sigma}}\\ &\le c\,r_0^{-2}\Big(\fint_{\frac{1}{2}Q_0} \big|\mathbf{w}_m\big|^{\frac{3\sigma}{3+\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{3+\sigma}{3\sigma}}\\ &\le c\,r_0^{-3}\Big(\fint_{Q_0} \big|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_m\big|^{\sigma}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad m\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Since additionally $\partial_t\mathbf{z}_m$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\sigma(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$ by Lemma 2.5, we get $T_2 \to 0$ as $m\to\infty$.

Furthermore, we have

$$T_1 = \int \big(\partial_t\big(\mathbf{z}_m - \mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\big)\Delta\big(\zeta\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int \big(\partial_t\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\Delta\big(\zeta\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t =: T_{1,1} + T_{1,2},$$

where the first term can be bounded using Theorem 2.13 (h). So it remains to show that

$$T_{1,2} := \int \big(\partial_t\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\Delta\big(\zeta\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \longrightarrow 0 \qquad \text{as } m\to\infty.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}T_{1,2} &= -\int \frac{1}{2}\partial_t(|\nabla\mathbf{z}_{m,k}|^2)\zeta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int \big(\partial_t\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\operatorname{div}\big(\nabla\zeta\otimes\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &= \int \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\mathbf{z}_{m,k}|^2\partial_t\zeta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int \big(\partial_t\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\operatorname{div}\big(\nabla\zeta\otimes\mathbf{z}_{m,k}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\end{aligned}$$

The first term is estimated by Theorem 2.13(e). For the second we use Lemma 2.5 ($s=\sigma$), Lemma 2.11 to find

$$\begin{aligned}&\int |\partial_t\mathbf{z}_{m,k}||\operatorname{div}\big(\nabla\zeta\otimes\mathbf{z}_{m,k}|\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &\le c\Big(\int_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} |\mathbf{G}_m|^\sigma + |\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_m|^\sigma\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}\Big(\int_{\frac{1}{3}Q_0} |\nabla\mathbf{z}_{m,k} + \mathbf{z}_{m,k}|^{\sigma'}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma'}}.\end{aligned}$$

Now because $\mathbf{G}_m$ and $\nabla^2\mathbf{z}_m$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\sigma(\frac{1}{2}Q_0)$ we find by Theorem 2.13 (e), that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} T_{1,2} = 0,$$

which proves the claim of (i). $\square$

The following corollary is useful in the application of the solenoidal Lipschitz truncation.

Corollary 2.15. *Let all assumptions of Theorem 2.14 be satisfied with* $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ *with* $\chi_{\frac{1}{8}Q_0} \leq \zeta \leq \chi_{\frac{1}{6}Q_0}$ *as in the proof of Theorem 2.14. If additionally* $\mathbf{u}_m$ *is uniformly bounded in* $L^\infty(I_0, L^\sigma(B_0))$*, then*

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int (\mathbf{G}_{1,m} : \nabla\mathbf{u}_m)\zeta\chi_{\mathcal{O}_{m,k}^\complement}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k/p}.$$

Proof. We start with (i) of Theorem 2.14.

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int \mathbf{G}_m : \nabla\mathbf{u}_{m,k}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,\lambda_{m,k}^p|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}| \leq c\,2^{-k} \tag{2.25}$$

Recall that $\mathbf{u}_{m,k} = \mathrm{curl}(\zeta\mathbf{z}_{m,k}) + \mathrm{curl}(\zeta(\mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{z}_m))$. We have $\mathbf{z}_{m,k}, \nabla\mathbf{z}_{m,k} \to 0$ in $L^\infty(\frac{1}{4}Q_0)$ by Theorem 2.13 for $m \to \infty$ and k fixed. Since $\mathbf{u}_m$ is a strong null sequence in $L^\sigma(Q_0)$ and is bounded in $L^\infty(I_0, L^\sigma(B_0))$ we get $\mathbf{u}_m \to 0$ strongly in $L^s(I_0, L^\sigma(B_0))$ for any $s \in (1,\infty)$. By continuity of the Bogovskiĭ operator we get the same convergence for $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_m$. Now, Lemma 2.1 implies $\mathbf{w}_m = \mathrm{curl}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_m \to 0$ in $L^s(I_0, W^{1,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Using $\mathbf{z}_m := \Delta\Delta^{-2}_{\frac{1}{2}Q_0}\Delta\mathbf{w}_m$ and Corollary 2.3 we also get $\mathbf{z}_m \to 0$ in $L^s(I_0, W^{1,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Since $\mathbf{z}_m - \mathbf{w}_m$ is harmonic on $\frac{1}{4}Q_0$, we have $\mathbf{z}_m - \mathbf{w}_m \to 0$ in $L^s(I_0, W^{2,s}(\frac{1}{6}B_0))$. These convergences imply that

$$\nabla\mathbf{u}_{m,k} = \zeta\nabla\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{z}_{m,k} + \mathbf{a}_{m,k},$$

with $\mathbf{a}_{m,k} \to 0$ in $L^s(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ for $m \to \infty$ and k fixed. This, the boundedness of $\mathbf{G}_m$ in $L^\sigma(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ and (2.25) imply (using $s > \sigma'$)

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int (\mathbf{G}_m : \nabla\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{z}_{m,k})\zeta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k}.$$

Since $\mathbf{G}_m = \mathbf{G}_{1,m} + \mathbf{G}_{2,m}$, $\mathbf{G}_{2,m} \to 0$ in $L^\sigma(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ and $\mathbf{z}_{m,k} \rightharpoonup 0$ in $L^{\sigma'}(\frac{1}{6}Qz)$ for $m \to \infty$ and k fixed, we get

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int (\mathbf{G}_{1,m} : \nabla\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{z}_{m,k})\zeta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k}. \tag{2.26}$$

The boundedness of $\mathbf{G}_{1,m}$ in $L^{p'}(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ and Theorem 2.13 (g) proves

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int (\mathbf{G}_{1,m} : \nabla\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{z}_{m,k})\zeta\chi_{\mathcal{O}_{m,k}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k/p}.$$

This and (2.26) yields the assertion. □

Remark 2.16 (The higher dimensional case)**.** *For general dimensions, the solenoidal Lipschitz truncation is best understood in terms of differential forms. We start with* $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ *as given in* (2.2)*. Now, we have to find* $\mathbf{w}$ *such that* $\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{w} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ *and* $\mathrm{div}\mathbf{w} = 0$*. Let us define the 1-form* α *on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *associated to the vector field* $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ *by* $\alpha := \sum_i \tilde{u}_i dx^i$*. Then we need to find a 2-form* ω *such that* $d^*\omega = \alpha$ *and* $d\omega = 0$*, where* d *is the outer derivative and* d^* *its adjunct by the scalar product for* k*-forms. Similar to* $\mathbf{w} = \mathrm{curl}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathrm{curl}\Delta^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ *we get* ω *by* $\omega := d\Delta^{-1}\alpha$*. Since, we are on the whole space* Δ^{-1} *can be constructed by mollification with* $c\,|x|^{2-n}$*. Thus, we have*

$$\omega(x) = (d\Delta^{-1}\alpha)(x) = d\sum_i \bigg(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\mathbf{u}_i(y)}{|x-y|^{d-2}}dy\bigg)dx^i.$$

Let us explain how to substitute the equation $\partial_t\Delta\mathbf{w} = -\mathrm{curl}\mathrm{div}\mathbf{G}$*, see* (2.6)*. Instead of test functions* $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ *with* $\mathrm{div}\boldsymbol{\psi} = 0$ *we use the associated 1-forms* $\beta = \sum_i \psi_i dx^i$ *with* $d^*\beta = 0$*. Thus there exists a 2-form* γ *with* $d^*\gamma = 0$*. Then*

$$\langle\partial_t\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \boldsymbol{\psi}\rangle = \langle\partial_t\alpha, \beta\rangle = \langle\partial_t d^*\omega, d^*\gamma\rangle = \langle\partial_t dd^*\omega, \gamma\rangle = \langle-\partial_t\Delta\omega, \gamma\rangle,$$

where we used $-\Delta = dd^* + d^*d$ *and* $d\alpha = 0$ *in the last step. Note that* $-\Delta$ *applied to the form* ω *is the same as* $-\Delta$ *applied to the vector field of all components of* ω*. Now we define* $\mathbf{w}$ *as the associated vector field (with* $\binom{n}{2}$ *components) of* ω *and we arrive again at an equation for* $\partial_t\Delta\mathbf{w}$*. This concludes the construction; the rest can be done exactly as for dimension three. The restriction* $p > \frac{6}{5}$ *in Section 3 will change to* $\frac{2n}{n+2}$*.*

3. Application to generalized Newtonian fluids

In this section we show how the solenoidal Lipschitz truncation can be used to simplify the existence proof for weak solutions of the power law fluids. We are able to work completely in the pressure free formulation.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $p > \frac{6}{5}$*,* $Q := (0,T)\times\Omega$*,* $\mathbf{f} \in L^{p'}(Q)$ *and* $\mathbf{v}_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$*. Then there is a solution* $\mathbf{v} \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^p(0,T;W^{1,p}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega))$ *to*

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_Q \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v})) : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t &= \int\limits_Q \mathbf{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_Q \mathbf{v}\otimes\mathbf{v} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \int\limits_Q \mathbf{v}\,\partial_t\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_\Omega \mathbf{v}_0\,\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}([0,T)\times\Omega)$*.*

Proof. We start with an approximated system whose solution is known to exist. Let $\mathbf{v}_m \in L^q(I;W^{1,q}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(B)) \cap L^\infty(I;L^2(B))$ be a solution to

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\limits_Q \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v})) : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{m}\int\limits_Q |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v})|^{q-2}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}) : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int\limits_Q \mathbf{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_Q \mathbf{v}\otimes\mathbf{v} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_Q \mathbf{v}\,\partial_t\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_\Omega \mathbf{v}_0\,\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}([0,T)\times\Omega)$, where $q > \max\{\frac{5p}{5p-6}, p\}$.

Due to the choice of q the space of test functions coincides with the space where the solution is constructed and the convective term becomes a compact perturbation. The existence of $\mathbf{v}_m$ is therefore standard and can be proved by monotone operator theory. Since we are allowed to test with $\mathbf{v}_m$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{v}_m(t)\|^2_{L^2} + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_\Omega \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{m}\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)|^q\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}s \\ = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{v}_0\|^2_{L^2} + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_\Omega \mathbf{f} : \mathbf{v}_m\,dx\,\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for all $t \in (0,T)$. By coercivity and Korn's inequality we get

$$\int\limits_Q \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \geq c\bigg(\int\limits_Q |\nabla\mathbf{v}_m|^p\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t - 1\bigg)$$

thus

$$\|m^{-1/q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)\|_{q,Q} + \|\mathbf{v}_m\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|\nabla\mathbf{v}_m\|_{p,Q} \leq c. \tag{3.4}$$

Hence we find a function $\mathbf{v} \in L^p(0,T;W^{1,p}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega))\cap L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ such that for a subsequence

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\mathbf{v}_m &\rightharpoonup \nabla\mathbf{v} && \text{in } L^p(Q),\\ \mathbf{v}_m &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{v} && \text{in } L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)),\\ \frac{1}{m}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)|^{q-2}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m) &\to 0 && \text{in } L^{q'}(Q),\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Since $\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m))$ is bounded in $L^{p'}(Q)$ by (3.4), there exist $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} \in L^{p'}(Q)$ with

$$\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) \rightharpoonup \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \quad \text{in } L^{p'}(Q). \tag{3.6}$$

Let us have a look at the time derivative. From equation (3.2) we get the uniform boundedness of $\partial_t \mathbf{v}_m$ in $L^p(0,T;(W^{3,2}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega))^*)$ and weak convergence of $\partial_t \mathbf{v}_m$ to $\partial_t \mathbf{v}$ in the same space (for a subsequence). This shows by using the compactness of the embedding $W^{1,p}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{2\sigma_2}_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega)$ for some $\sigma_2 > 1$ (which follows from our assumption $p > \frac{6}{5}$, resp. $p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$) and the Aubin-Lions theorem [Lio69] that $\mathbf{v}_m \to \mathbf{v}$ in $L^\sigma(0,T,L^{2\sigma_2}_{\mathrm{div}}(\Omega))$. This and the boundedness in $L^\infty((0,T);L^2(\Omega))$ imply that for some $\sigma > 1$

$$\mathbf{v}_m \to \mathbf{v} \quad \text{in } L^s(0,T;L^{2\sigma}(\Omega)) \quad \text{for all } s < \infty. \tag{3.7}$$

As a consequence we have

$$\mathbf{v}_m \otimes \mathbf{v}_m \to \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v} \quad \text{in } L^s(0,T;L^{\sigma}(\Omega)) \quad \text{for all } s < \infty. \tag{3.8}$$

Overall, we get our limit equation

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_Q \tilde{\mathbf{S}} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = \int\limits_Q \mathbf{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_Q \mathbf{v}\otimes\mathbf{v} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\varphi})\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ + \int\limits_Q \mathbf{v}\,\partial_t\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_\Omega \mathbf{v}_0\,\boldsymbol{\varphi}(0)\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}([0,T)\times\Omega)$.

All of the forthcoming effort is to prove $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}))$ almost everywhere. We start with the difference of the equation of $\mathbf{v}_m$ and the limit equation.

$$\begin{aligned}&-\int\limits_Q (\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v})\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int\limits_Q (\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}) : \nabla\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad = \int\limits_Q \big(\mathbf{v}_m\otimes\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v}\otimes\mathbf{v} + m^{-1}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)|^{q-2}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)\big) : \nabla\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}([0,T)\times\Omega)$. We define $\mathbf{u}_m := \mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v}$. Then by (3.7)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u}_m &\rightharpoonup \mathbf{0} && \text{in } L^p(0,T;W^{1,p}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(\Omega)),\\ \mathbf{u}_m &\to \mathbf{0} && \text{in } L^{2\sigma}(Q).\\ \mathbf{u}_m &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{0} && \text{in } L^\infty((0,T;L^2(\Omega)).\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Thus, we can write (3.10) as

$$\int\limits_{(0,T)\times\Omega} \mathbf{u}_m\cdot\partial_t\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\ \mathrm{d}t\ =\ \int\limits_{(0,T)\times\Omega} \mathbf{H}_m : \nabla\boldsymbol{\varphi}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \tag{3.12}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in C^\infty_{0,\mathrm{div}}(Q)$, where $\mathbf{H}_m := \mathbf{H}_{1,m} + \mathbf{H}_{2,m}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{H}_{1,m} &:= \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) - \tilde{\mathbf{S}},\\
\mathbf{H}_{2,m} &:= \mathbf{v}_m \otimes \mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v} + m^{-1}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)|^{q-2}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (3.5) and (3.7) imply

$$\|\mathbf{H}_{1,m}\|_{p'} \leq c \tag{3.13}$$

as well as

$$\mathbf{H}_{2,m} \to 0 \quad \text{in } L^\sigma(Q). \tag{3.14}$$

Now take any cylinder $Q_0 \Subset (0,T)\times\Omega$. Now, (3.11), (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14) ensure that we can apply Corollary 2.15. In particular, for suitable $\zeta \in C^\infty_0(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ with $\chi_{\frac{1}{8}Q_0} \leq \zeta \leq \chi_{\frac{1}{6}Q_0}$ Corollary 2.15 implies

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int \big(\mathbf{H}_{1,m} : \nabla(\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v})\big)\zeta\chi_{\mathcal{O}^\complement_{m,k}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k/p}.$$

In other words

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int \Big(\big(\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}\big) : \nabla(\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v})\Big)\zeta\chi_{\mathcal{O}^\complement_{m,k}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k/p}.$$

Now, the boundedness of $\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}))$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$ in $L^{p'}(\frac{1}{6}Q_0)$ and Theorem 2.14 (h) and (g) gives

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int \Big(\big(\tilde{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}))\big) : \nabla(\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v})\Big)\zeta\chi_{\mathcal{O}^\complement_{m,k}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k/p}.$$

This and the previous estimate imply

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left|\int \Big(\big(\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}))\big) : \nabla(\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v})\Big)\zeta\chi_{\mathcal{O}^\complement_{m,k}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq c\,2^{-k/p}.$$

Let $\theta \in (0,1)$. Then by Hölder's inequality and Theorem 2.14 (h) and (g)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{m\to\infty}\int \Big(\big(\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}))\big) : \nabla(\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v})\Big)^\theta\zeta\chi_{\mathcal{O}_{m,k}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&\qquad\leq c\,|\mathcal{O}_{m,k}|^{1-\theta} \leq c\,2^{-(1-\theta)\frac{k}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This, the previous estimate and Hölder's inequality give

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\int \Big(\big(\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}))\big) : \nabla(\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v})\Big)^\theta\zeta\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \leq c\,2^{-(1-\theta)\frac{k}{p}}.$$

For $k \to \infty$ the right hand side converges to zero. Now, the monotonicity of $\mathbf{S}$ implies that $\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}_m)) \to \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{v}))$ a.e. on $\frac{1}{8}Q_0$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

□

4. Solenoidal truncation – stationary case

In this section we show how the solenoidal Lipschitz truncation based on the curl-representation works in the stationary case. This provides a simplified approach to the solenoidal Lipschitz truncation in [BDF12], which was based on local Bogovskiĭ projections.

Let us start with a ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,s}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(B)$ with $s \in (1,\infty)$. Since $\mathbf{u}$ is solenoidal, we can define $\mathbf{w} := \mathrm{curl}^{-1}\mathbf{u}$. According to (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5) we have $\mathbf{w} \in W^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|\nabla \mathbf{w}\|_s \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_s$ and $\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}\|_s \leq \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_s$ and $\mathrm{div}\mathbf{w} = 0$. Since $\mathrm{curl}\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{w} = -\Delta \mathbf{w} + \nabla \mathrm{div}\mathbf{w} = -\Delta \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u} = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$, it follows that $\mathbf{w}$ is harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$.

For $\lambda > 0$ define $\mathcal{O}_\lambda := \{M(\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}) > \lambda\}$, where M is the standard non-centered maximal operator, i.e. $Mf(x) := \sup_{B' \ni x} ⨍_{B'} |f| \,\mathrm{d}y$ (the supremum is taken over all balls $B' \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ containing x). As in Section 2 there exists a Whitney covering $\{Q_i\}$ (of balls) of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ with:

(W1) $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2} Q_i = \mathcal{O}_\lambda$,

(W2) for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $8Q_i \subset \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and $16Q_i \cap (\mathbb{R}^{3+1} \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda) \neq \emptyset$,

(W3) if $Q_i \cap Q_j \neq \emptyset$ then $\frac{1}{2} r_j \leq r_i < 2\, r_j$ and $|Q_i \cap Q_j| \geq c \max\{|Q_j|, |Q_k|\}$.

(W4) at every point at most 120^{3+2} of the sets $4Q_i$ intersect,

where r_i is the radius of Q_i.

For each Q_i we define $A_i := \{j : Q_j \cap Q_i \neq \emptyset\}$. Note that $\#A_i \leq 120^{3+2}$ and $r_j \sim r_i$ for all $j \in A_i$. With respect to the covering $\{Q_i\}$ there exists a partition of unity $\{\varphi_i\} \subset C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

(P1) $\chi_{\frac{1}{2}Q_i} \leq \varphi_i \leq \chi_{\frac{2}{3}Q_i}$,

(P2) $\sum_j \varphi_j = \sum_{j \in A_i} \varphi_j = 1$ on Q_i,

(P3) $|\varphi_i| + r_i |\nabla \varphi_i| + r_i^2 |\nabla^2 \varphi_i| \leq c$.

Then the solenoidal Lipschitz truncation of $\mathbf{u}$ is pointwise defined as

$$\mathbf{u}_\lambda := \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{curl}(\varphi_j \mathbf{w}_j) & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_\lambda, \\ \mathbf{u} & \text{elsewhere}, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

with $\mathbf{w}_j := \Pi^1_{Q_j} \mathbf{w}$, where $\Pi^1_{Q_j}$ denotes the first order averaged Taylor polynomial on Q_j, see [BS94, DR07]. We begin with some estimates for $\mathbf{w}$.

Lemma 4.1. *For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $Q_j \cap Q_k \neq \emptyset$ we have*

(a) $⨍_{Q_j} |\frac{\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_j}{r_j^2}| \,\mathrm{d}x + ⨍_{Q_j} |\frac{\nabla(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_j)}{r_j}| \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c ⨍_{Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}| \,\mathrm{d}x$.

(b) $⨍_{Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}| \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c\, \lambda$.

(c) $\|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_j)} \le c \fint_{Q_j} |\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_j| \, \mathrm{d}x + c \fint_{Q_k} |\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_k| \, \mathrm{d}x$.

(d) $\|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_j)} \le c \, r_j^2 \, \lambda$.

Proof. The first part (a) is just a consequence of the classical Poincaré estimate and the properties of $\Pi^1_{Q_j}$, see [DR07, Lemma 3.1]. The second part (b) follows from $Q_j \subset 16Q_j$ and $16Q_j \cap \mathcal{O}_\lambda^{\complement} \neq \emptyset$, so $\fint_{16Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}| \, \mathrm{d}x \le \lambda$.

Part (c) follows from the geometric property of the Q_j. If $Q_j \cap Q_k \neq \emptyset$, then $|Q_j \cap Q_k| \ge c \max\{|Q_j|, |Q_k|\}$. This and the norm equivalence for linear polynomials imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_j)} &\le c \fint_{Q_j \cap Q_k} |\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k| \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\le c \fint_{Q_j} |\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}| \ \mathrm{d}x + c \fint_{Q_k} |\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_k| \ \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, (d) is a consequence of (c), (a) and (b). ☐

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $c_0 > 0$ such that $\lambda \ge \lambda_0 := c_0 (\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^s \, \mathrm{d}x)^{\frac{1}{s}}$ implies $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \subset 2B$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus 2B$. We have to show that $x \notin \mathcal{O}_\lambda$. We will show that $\fint_{B'} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}| \, \mathrm{d}x \le c \, (\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^s \, \mathrm{d}x)^{\frac{1}{s}}$ for any ball B' containing x.

First, assume that $B' \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Then $|B'| \ge c \, |B|$ and

$$\fint_{B'} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}| \, \mathrm{d}x \le c \left(\frac{|B|}{|B'|} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \left(\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^s \, \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \le c \left(\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^s \, \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{s}},$$

where we used Hölder's inequality and $\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}\|_s \le c \, \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_s$ by (2.5).

Second, assume that $B' \cap B = \emptyset$. Let B'' denote the largest ball with the same center as B' such that $B'' \cap B = \emptyset$. Then $|B''| \ge c \, |B|$. Since $\mathbf{w}$ is harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$, it follows by the interior estimates for harmonic functions, $\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}\|_s \le c \, \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_s$ and $|B''| \ge c \, |B|$ that

$$\fint_{B'} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}| \, \mathrm{d}x \le c \left(\fint_{B''} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}|^s \, \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \le c \left(\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^s \, \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{s}}.$$

This proves the claim. ☐

We can conclude now, that $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ is a global Sobolev function.

Lemma 4.3. *We have for $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$*

$$\mathbf{u}_\lambda - \mathbf{u} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \operatorname{curl}(\varphi_j (\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w})) \in W^{1,1}_0(2B),$$

where the sum converges in $W^{1,1}_0(2B)$. In particular, $\mathbf{u}_\lambda \in W^{1,1}_0(2B)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to [BDF12, DKS12]. Note that the convergence will be unconditionally, i.e. irrespectively of the order of summation. Obviously, the convergence holds pointwise. Since $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, it follows by Lemma 4.2 that $Q_j \subset \mathcal{O}_\lambda \subset 2B$. In particular, each summand is in $W_0^{1,1}(2B)$. It remains to prove convergence of the sum in $W_0^{1,1}(2B)$ in the gradient norm. We will show absolute convergence of the gradients in L^1. The estimates for φ_i and Lemma 4.1 (a) imply

$$\sum_j \int |\nabla \operatorname{curl}(\varphi_j(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}))| \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c \sum_j \int\limits_{Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}| \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c \, \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}\|_{L^1(2B)}.$$

Now $\nabla^2 \mathbf{w} \in L^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ proves the claim. □

The following theorem describes the basic properties of the Lipschitz truncation. It is a combination of the techniques of [DMS08, BDF12, DKS12].

Theorem 4.4. *If* $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,s}_{0,\operatorname{div}}(B)$ *and* $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, *then* $\mathbf{u}_\lambda \in W^{1,\infty}_{0,\operatorname{div}}(2B)$ *and*

(a) $\mathbf{u}_\lambda = \mathbf{u}$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{M(\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}) > \lambda\}$.

(b) $\|\mathbf{u}_\lambda\|_q \leq c \, \|\mathbf{u}\|_q$ *for* $1 < q < \infty$ *provided* $\mathbf{u} \in L^q(B)$.

(c) $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda\|_q \leq c \, \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_q$ *for* $1 < q < \infty$ *provided* $\mathbf{u} \in W_0^{1,q}(B)$.

(d) $|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda| \leq c \, \lambda \chi_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} + |\nabla \mathbf{u}| \chi_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda} \leq c \, \lambda$ *almost everywhere for all* $\lambda > 0$.

Proof. We will use the representation of Lemma 4.3. The claim (a) follows from $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi_j) \subset \mathcal{O}_\lambda$. We estimate as in the proof of Lemma 4.2

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \operatorname{curl}(\varphi_j(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w})) \Big\|_q^q &\leq c \sum_j \int\limits_{Q_j} \frac{|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}|^q}{r_j^q} + |\nabla(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w})|^q \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq c \sum_j \int\limits_{Q_j} |\nabla \mathbf{w}|^q \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c \, \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^q\end{aligned}$$

using the properties of the averaged Taylor polynomial, see [DR07, Lemma 3.1], and (2.4). Similarly, with (2.5)

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \nabla \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \operatorname{curl}(\varphi_j(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w})) \Big\|_q^q &\leq c \sum_j \int\limits_{Q_j} \frac{|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}|^q}{r_j^{2q}} + \frac{|\nabla(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w})|^q}{r_j^q} + |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}|^q \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq c \sum_j \int\limits_{Q_j} |\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}|^q \,\mathrm{d}x \leq c \, \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_q^q.\end{aligned}$$

This and the representation of Lemma 4.3 prove (b) and (c).

Let us show (d). It suffices to verify $|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda| \leq c\,\lambda$ on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, since on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ we have $|\nabla \mathbf{u}| \leq M(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \leq M(\nabla^2 \mathbf{w}) \leq \lambda$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(Q_k)} &= \bigg\| \sum_{j \in A_k} \nabla \mathrm{curl}(\varphi_j(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k)) \bigg\|_{L^\infty(Q_k)} \\ &\leq c \sum_{j \in A_k} \Big(r_k^{-2} \|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_j)} + r_k^{-1} \|\nabla(\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k)\|_{L^\infty(Q_j)} \Big) \\ &\leq c \sum_{j \in A_k} r_k^{-2} \|\mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_j)} \leq c\,\lambda,\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sum_{j \in A_k} \varphi_j = 1$ on Q_k, inverse estimates for linear polynomials and Lemma 4.1 (d). Now $\mathcal{O}_\lambda = \bigcup_k Q_k$ proves (d). ☐

The following theorem is an application of the Lipschitz truncation to weak null sequences. It is similar to the results in [DMS08, BDF12, DKS12], which were used to prove the existence of weak solutions.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $1 < s < \infty$ and let $\mathbf{u}_m \in W^{1,s}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(B)$ be a weak $W^{1,s}_{0,\mathrm{div}}$ null sequence. Then there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a double sequence $\lambda_{m,j} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $2^{2^j} \leq \lambda_{m,j} \leq 2^{2^{j+1}-1}$ such that the Lipschitz truncations $\mathbf{u}_{m,j} := \mathbf{u}_{\lambda_{m,j}}$ have the following properties for $j \geq j_0$.*

(a) *$\mathbf{u}_{m,j} \in W^{1,\infty}_{0,\mathrm{div}}(2B)$ and $\mathbf{u}_{m,j} = \mathbf{u}_m$ on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{O}_{m,j}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathcal{O}_{m,j} := \{M(\nabla^2(\mathrm{curl}^{-1}\mathbf{u}_m)) > \lambda_{m,j}\}$.*

(b) *$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_{m,j}\|_\infty \leq c\lambda_{m,j}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

(c) *$\mathbf{u}_{m,j} \to 0$ for $m \to \infty$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$,*

(d) *$\nabla \mathbf{u}_{m,j} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0$ for $m \to \infty$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$,*

(e) *For all $m, j \in \mathbb{N}$ holds $\|\lambda_{m,j}\chi_{\mathcal{O}_{m,j}}\|_s \leq c(q)\, 2^{-\frac{j}{s}} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_m\|_s$.*

Proof. The proof is almost exactly as in [BDF12, DKS12] once we have Theorem 4.4. We only use additionally the continuity properties of curl^{-1}, see (2.4) and (2.5). We therefore omit a detailed proof. ☐

[AF88] E. Acerbi and N. Fusco, *An approximation lemma for $W^{1,p}$ functions*, Material instabilities in continuum mechanics (Edinburgh, 1985–1986), Oxford Sci. Publ., Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1988, pp. 1–5.

[AM74] G. Astarita and G. Marrucci, *Principles of non-newtonian fluid mechanics*, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

[BAH87] R. Bird, R. Armstrong, and O. Hassager, *Dynamics of polymeric liquids, volume 1 fluid mechanics*, second edition ed., John Whily, 1987.

[BDF12] D. Breit, L. Diening, and M. Fuchs, *Solenoidal Lipschitz truncation and applications in fluid mechanics*, J. Differential Equations **253** (2012), no. 6, 1910–1942.

[Bog80] M. E. Bogovskiĭ, *Solutions of some problems of vector analysis, associated with the operators* div *and* grad, Theory of cubature formulas and the application of functional analysis to problems of mathematical physics (Russian), Akad. Nauk SSSR Sibirsk. Otdel. Inst. Mat., Novosibirsk, 1980, pp. 5–40, 149.

[BS94] Susanne C. Brenner and L. Ridgway Scott, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 15, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[DcS10] L. Diening, M. Růžička, and K. Schumacher, *A decomposition technique for John domains*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A. I. Math. **35** (2010), 87–114.

[DKS12] L. Diening, Ch. Kreuzer, and E. Süli, *Finite element approximation of steady flows of incompressible fluids with implicit power-law-like rheology*, submitted (2012).

[DMS08] L. Diening, J. Málek, and M. Steinhauer, *On Lipschitz truncations of Sobolev functions (with variable exponent) and their selected applications*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **14** (2008), no. 2, 211–232.

[DR07] L. Diening and M. Růžička, *Interpolation operators in Orlicz Sobolev spaces*, Num. Math. **107** (2007), no. 1, 107–129.

[DRW10] Lars Diening, Michael Růžička, and Jörg Wolf, *Existence of weak solutions for unsteady motions of generalized Newtonian fluids*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **9** (2010), no. 1, 1–46.

[Eyr36] H. J. Eyring, *Viscosity, plasticity, and diffusion as example of absolute reaction rates*, J. Chemical Physics **4** (1936), 283–291.

[FMS03] J. Frehse, J. Málek, and M. Steinhauer, *On analysis of steady flows of fluids with shear-dependent viscosity based on the Lipschitz truncation method*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **34** (2003), no. 5, 1064–1083 (electronic).

[KL02] J. Kinnunen and J. L. Lewis, *Very weak solutions of parabolic systems of p-Laplacian type*, Ark. Mat. **40** (2002), no. 1, 105–132.

[Lad67] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, *New equations for the description of motion of viscous incompressible fluids and solvability in the large of boundary value problems for them*, Proc. Stek. Inst. Math. **102** (1967), 95–118.

[Lad68] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, *Modifications of the Navier-Stokes equations for large gradients of the velocities*, Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI) **7** (1968), 126–154.

[Lad69] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, *The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow*, Second English edition, revised and enlarged. Translated from the Russian by Richard A. Silverman and John Chu. Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 2, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1969.

[Lio69] J.-L. Lions, *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod, 1969.

[Mül95] R. Müller, *Das schwache Dirichletproblem in L^q für den Bipotentialoperator in beschränkten Gebieten und in Außengebieten*, Bayreuth. Math. Schr. (1995), no. 49, 115–211, Dissertation, Universität Bayreuth, Bayreuth, 1994.

[Růž00] M. Růžička, *Electrorheological fluids: modeling and mathematical theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1748, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.

[Ste93] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.

[Wol07] J. Wolf, *Existence of weak solutions to the equations of nonstationary motion of non- newtonian fluids with shear-dependent viscosity*, J. Math. Fluid Mech. **9** (2007), 104–138.